

Impact of Demographic Factors on Deviant Workplace Behavior in the Pakistani Public Organizations

Author's Details:

⁽¹⁾Dr. Mohd Nazri Baharom-Senior Lecturer, Ghazali Shafie Graduate School of Government, University Utara Malaysia - Email: mnazri@uum.edu.my ⁽²⁾Dr. Mohd Dino Khairi Bin Sharfuddin-Senior Lecturer, UUM College of Law, Government and International Studies, University Utara Malaysia-Email: dino@uum.edu.my ⁽³⁾Javed Iqbal (Corresponding Author)- PhD Scholar, Ghazali Shafie Graduate School of Government, University Utara Malaysia Email: javedlatif2016@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated the impact of Demographic factors, i.e., Gender, Marital Status, Education, Experience, Tenure, Level of job and Nature of employment on deviant workplace behaviour (DWB) and under the theoretical support of Social exchange theory, social learning theory and Breach of psychological contract theory. The results were analyzed from a sample of 380 employees from 20 Public organizations, i.e., universities, autonomous bodies and special institutions providing services to promote education and training sector in the Punjab province of Pakistan are selected for the questionnaire survey. SPSS-21 is employed to analyze the quantitative data. Results revealed significant relationship and supported the hypothesized direct impact of demographic factors on deviant workplace behavior in the Pakistani public organizations.

Key words: Deviant Workplace Behavior, Demographic Factors, Public Organisations.

Introduction

In the present era, the study of the behavior of an individual in the workplace has become imperative due to globalization, industrialization and technological advancement (Appelbaum, Deguire, & Lay, 2005). Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) is one of the most vital research areas that influencing the behavior of employees at the workplace (Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007) and effecting the health of organization (Yildiz, Alpan, Ates & Sezen, 2015). Deviance workplace behavior (DWB) is a vital concern for research due to its evolving (Yildiz et al. 2015) and growing level and possible outcome an influence (Spector & Fox, 2005). Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) is not a fresh knowledge to discuss in the corporate world (Javed, Amjad, Faqeer-Ul-Ummi, & Bukhari, (2014) but resources which create deviance workplace behavior are still guiding new dimension to examine with the passage of time and circumstances (Shakir & Siddique, 2014). The literature review of various scholars have defined DWB (Appelbaum et al. 2007) and clarify the outcomes of deviant workplace behaviors, but studies regarding workplace deviance behaviors are still need be considered (Yıldız et al. 2015).

Unfortunately, Pakistan is one of the developing countries who are facing the serious problem of workplace deviance of employees in public organizations since its independence 1947 (Bashir, Nasir, Qayyum & Bashir, 2012, p.241; Nadeem, Ahmad, Ahmad, Batool & Shafiq, 2015). Public organizations of Pakistan derived inheritance from colonial system of the 18th century but after passing 70 years of independence could not incept its indigenous practices to run the public machinery for managing people and resources of the country (Nadeem et al.2015;Bashir et al.2012). The public sector is rife with corruption from top to bottom (Nadeem et al. 2015). Every cog of public administration machinery is reflected counterproductive behavior (Yousaf et al. 2015) or anti-social behavior either financially corrupt or ethically deviant (Nasir & Bashir, 2012). It is a common understanding that Pakistani organizations controlled, managed, and regulated (Nadeem et al. 2015) and operated by the government, either autonomous or semi-autonomous are characteristically ailing with deviance behavior at the workplace of the public employees (Bashir et al. 2012, p.241).

In addition, these days, an unethical and deviant workplace behavior is an emerging issue/problem in the organizations (Usmani, Kalpina, & Husain, 2013) and widespread problem in most of the Pakistani organizations (Fatima, Atif, Saqib & Haider 2012) but remain unexplored (Bashir, Nasir, Saeed & Ahmed

2011). Favoritism, nepotism, and cronyism are also the major of causes of deviant workplace behavior in Pakistani public organizations (Bashir et al. 2011). The whole operation of public administration is trapped in red tape that affects the behavior of the employee towards resigned satisfaction (Quartulain & Khan, 2013).

Literature Review and Framework

Deviant Workplace Behavior (DWB)

Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) has been studied under different terms such as retaliation and dysfunctional behavior, organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996) and counterproductive workplace behavior (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). According to Robinson & Greenberg, (1998 pp.3) “there is no common definition regarding workplace deviance that is generally agreed upon” due to initial stage of research area and cited the definition of two eminent scholars who have elaborate this construct of deviant workplace behavior, operationalized it and key dimension as well as recognized its boundaries.

Firstly, “anti-social behavior” that is defined as “any behavior that brings harm or is intended to bring harm to the organization and its employees or its stakeholders” (Greenberg, 1997).

Secondly, “workplace deviance” that is defined as “voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization and/its members” (Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Thirdly, “Organizational Misbehavior” “that is defined as “Any intentional action by members of the organization that violates the core organizational or societal norms” (Vardi & Wiener, 1996).

Deviant workplace behaviors (DWB) of employees are directly harmful to the organization or to other employees in the organization that can range from relatively minor to very serious (Kanten & Ülker, 2013). Griffin and Lopez (2004) noted that all individuals who enter to working organizations have the potential to exhibit this destructive behavior that Categories, minor and major deviance. The first, minor, production deviance (Robinson & Betnet,1995), working slow intentionally, avails excessive breaks (Bashir et al. 2012), gossiping on non-work topics with coworkers during official working hours, late arrival at workplace and leave office early, daydreaming while on job (Nasir & Bashir, 2012) and involved in cyberloafing (Lim, 2002). The second major, production deviance as theft from the organization, do slow work to obtain unnecessary due overtime, without receiving permission to use photocopy machines for personnel purpose, as well as taking office supplies or equipment at home (Anjum & Pervaiz, 2013;Spector&Fox, 2005). On the other hand, interpersonal deviance, has also two categories, minor and major, the first, political deviance is making fun, deal rudely and blaming to coworkers for mistakes did on job, disobeying supervisor’s directions and instructions (Robbinson & Betnnett, 1995) the second, personal aggression, (major) such as cursing, humiliating, bullying or stalking and saying hurtful things to coworkers and assaulting with injury to coworkers too (Brown 2008). Demissions of deviant workplace behavior contain the individual negative acts at the workplace such as Abuse or bullying means act to towards coworkers as well as organizational members are treating and handling them violently (Kohut, 2007). It consists of overt harmful behaviors of an employee (Izawa, Kodama, & Nomura, 2006). Eminent scholars Spector, Fox, Penney, (2006) asserts that abuse is an act to harm the fellow worker. Unpleasant comments are the main cause of abuse at the workplace (Contin, & Magley, 2003). Verbal aggression is constituted abuse (Porath & Erez, 2009). “Bullying” at workplace leads to abuse (Saunders et al. 2007; Monks et al. 2009). Moreover, “bullying” that means an act of dogged (Georgakopoulos, Wilkin, & Kent, 2011). According to Oghojafor, Muo and Olufayo (2012) “abusive, intimidating or insulting behavior, abuse of power or unfair punishment which upsets, threatens, humiliates the recipient, undermining their self-confidence, reputation, and ability to perform.”

Withdrawal is another dimension of deviant workplace intentions and behaviors of employees studied comprehensively in the organizational behavior, human resources management, and management field but remained below study (Carraher & Buckley, 2008). Withdrawals are negative behaviors that mitigate the intentional amount of working time than the required time by the organization (Spector et al. 2006).

Theft is stealing of the physical property or assets from the organization (Chen & Spector, 1992) and intentionally harmful to the organization (Niehoff & Paul, 2000) for the satisfaction of their instrumental motives (Spector et al. 2006). Another study recorded, theft as one of the aspects of deviant behavior instigate employee towards the breach of the organizational norms (Galperin, 2002). Theft or stealing can take different kinds, i.e., stealing merchandise, misleading records, pilferage, overcharging and short-changing, deception, payroll fraud and stealing cash and voiding a sale, etc. (Gabbidon et al. 2006; Mishra & Prasad, 2006).

According to Spector et al. (2006) Production deviance is another important the demission of deviant workplace behavior (DWB). In this category of deviance behavior, the employee is intentionally hampering quantity and quality of work and affect organizational productivity and efficiency (Hollinger & Clark, 1982). Job tasks are not performed or failure to perform in a proper way effectively (Hollinger, 1986). In this way, the employee intentionally slows down the quantity and quality of work that affects the efficiency and productive of the organization (Hollinger & Clark 1982; Gruys & Sackett 2003).

Sabotage workplace deviance has been of interest to a broad range of researchers and Practitioners (Ambrose, Seabright & Schmink, 2002). Sabotage is important to the dimension of deviant workplace behavior (DWB) which closely related to production deviance (Spector et al. (2006). However, production deviance is a passive whereas sabotage is the active approach, but in fact, both acts are knotted theoretically. Production deviance and sabotage are reflecting the two different kinds of behaviors, firstly, it indicates the not to do a task or do not task correctly and secondly, intentionally damaging something (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Robinson & Bennet, 1995).

Accepting Kickback is another type of property deviance Robbins & Bennett, (1995). According to (Bashir et al., 2012) accepting kickback is the type of corruption and it an important dimension of deviant workplace behavior in public organization. Corruption is a most serious dimension of deviance behavior prevalent in Pakistan at all levels like other factors of deviant workplace behavior (DWB) and have an impact on public organizations of countless developed and developing countries like Pakistan (Bashir et al. 2011).

A study of Bashir et al. 2012) have investigated that another dimensions of misuse of official time and resource of public organization and pointed out that the public employees carry out personal business during official timings, taking longer lunch/pray break and use unauthorized organization resources of the public organizations such as making long call personal calls from official telephone and playing games on official computer and chatting and gossiping during official working hours (Gruys, 1999; Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Spector et al., 2006; Lim, 2002).

Organizational dimensions of deviant workplace behavior contain the factors relate to an organization such as sabotage, production deviance, and Kickback/corruption cyberloafing, etc.

In current eras, numerous technological advancement inspired other imperative changes has been observed (Brkic & Aleksic, 2016) due to prompt development and innovation of information technologies as well as internet open door of different type deviance in the organization (Lim, 2002). Cyberloafing is one of them. In today's modern business world, it is practically impossible to work without computers equipment's an internet connection (Derina & Gökçeb 2016).

Demographic Factors

The demographic factors such as gender, marital status, age, tenure, experience, level of the job are also important factors/ variables to predict the workplace deviance in the Asian context and also affect the employee behavior (Farhadi, Omar, Nasir, Zarnaghash, & Salehi, 2015). Eight demographic factors, which are gender, education, marital status, age, organizational tenure, and rank/level of job holds within the organization, have significant differences in deviant workplace behavior (Farhadi et al. 2015). Gender is associated with workplace deviant behavior (Henle 2005). It is the general perception that females are more ethical than males. On the other hand, males are generally express explicit aggressions as compare to female (Douglas & Martinko, 2001;

Martinko et al. 2002; Martinko & Moss, 1999; Eagly & Steffen, 1986). Furthermore, different studies documented that males are generally apparent higher in the levels of self-serving biases as compare to females as well as males relatively more external in their characteristics as compared to females (Dobbins, Pence, Orban, & Sgro, 1983; Cash, Gillen & Burn, 1977). Females are more ethical as compare to males (O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Females are more likely to hold higher values (O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005) Moreover. Usually, males engaged aggressive Behaviours but not by females (Appelbaum et al. 2007). Female shows compassion attitude and empathy while male shows dilemmas with fairness and justice (Valentine & Rittenburg, 2007). A number of studies established a relationship between marital status and job performance. Research indicated that married employees are more responsible and committed to their jobs as compare to unmarried employees. Marital status is the one the predictor to judge the deviant workplace (Appelbaum et al. 2007). Age is significantly associated to ethical decision-making (Appelbaum et al. 2005). Furthermore, Age is related to deviant workplace behavior (Henel 2005). In fact, young employees are less honest as compare to elder employees (Appelbaum et al. 2007). Younger members of the workforce are linked to an "epidemic of moral laxity" because "more theft involvement has been found among younger employees" (Greenberg & Barling 1996). However, the research of O'Fallon and Butterfield, (2005) on the age of the individual shows mixed results regarding ethical decision-making. Age was the most influential predictor of deviant Behaviour at the workplace (Fardhi et al. 2015).

An individual who has a longer length of formal education is "more aware of the social world and his place in it" (VanSandt, Shepard, & Zappe, 2006). Thus education has a positive association with ethical decision-making (Appelbaum et al. 2005) Moreover, according to Rogoan, (2009) in case of corruption/Kickback high educated person are generally involved in a Mega corruption scandal. An individual who has more experience will behave and engage less unethically (Appelbaum et al. 2005; Appelbaum & Sapiro, 2006). Sims (2002) founded that Organization tenure was the factor with the most impact on the acceptance of unethical behaviors. Tenure is another dimension of demographic factors to predict the deviant behavior at the workplace. Appelbaum et al. (2005) defined as "The longer an employee is a member of an organization, the more unlikely it is that he will act unethically and engage in deviant acts." Employees with less tenure is an organization are more likely to engage in acts of property deviance and other types of workplace deviance" (Appelbaum et al. 2007). However, Henel, (2005) found that tenure was not significantly correlated to deviant workplace Behaviour. Long tenure employees have a high commitment between than short tenure employees (Fardhi et al. 2015). The level of job in the organization also predicts the deviance Behaviour at the workplace. Level of job describes the position/ status of an employee at the workplace, for example, high-level job, middle level, and low-level Job. Blue color employees are more indulge in workplace deviance (Anjum & Pervez, 2013). Nature of job/ employment in public organizations is an important dimension of the demographic variable to predict the deviant workplace behavior. Generally, there are three categories of job / employment in public organizations such as permanent, contractor work charge basis in Pakistan. It is a general perception that employee who is working on a temporary basis are more likely engaged in deviant workplace behavior.

The Relationship between demographic factors and DWB

The present study examines the relationship between demographic factors as the independent variable and deviant workplace behavior. Specifically, the relationship between the demographic factors, i.e., gender, marital status, age, education, and experience and tenure is examined. While, there is the other number of information of demographic determinants (e.g., religion, marginality position, family background) that may be referred in the study to describe the demographic. But focus on was chosen to be referred to gender, marital status, age, education, experience, tenure or length of service and nature of job described in this study.

The first, presumed determinant of a demographic factor is gender. Gender classify into two types male and female. It is general perception and belief that females are more ethical than the males. Research supports that males are more likely to express overt aggression as compared to the females (Douglas & Martinko, 2001).

It is documented that males have a higher level of the manifest of self-serving biases as compared to females (Dobbins, Pence, urban, & Sgro, 1983). In empirical research there is often no difference discovered between male and female but when their difference females are more ethical than males (O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Usually, males not females engage in aggressive Behaviour in the workplace (Appelbaum et al. 2007). The Second, presumed determinant of demographic factors is Marital Status. Different studies concluded the relationship between marital status and job performance and previous studies indicated that as married individuals take more responsibilities as compare to unmarried individuals. It is a general perception that married employees are more responsible behaved more ethical, more job satisfaction and avoid to deviant acts at the workplace.

The third, presumed determinant of demographic factors is age. Age is positively linked to the ethical decision (Appelbaum et al. 2005). Generally, elder employees are more honest as compared to young employees (Appelbaum et al. 2005). It is empirical that younger employees are associated with "epidemic of moral laxity" because involvement in theft has been found among younger employees" (Greenberg & Barling, 1996). But the research of O'Fallon and Butterfield, (2005) on age has shown mixed results regarding ethical decision making. The fourth, presumed determinant of a demographic factor is education. Education is associated with ethical decision making, more educated employee less likely engage in acts of deviance workplace and act unethically (Appelbaum et al., 2005). The fifth, presumed determinant of demographic factors is tenure. Tenure is also linked to unethically act and engage in deviant Behaviour (Appelbaum et al., 2005). Longer tenure of an employee in the organization, it is more likely act deviant and employee with less tenure involve in the deviance of property (Appelbaum et al., 2007). The lastly, presumed demission of demographic factors is the position of Job or level of the job. Level of job and nature of job are also related to deviant workplace behavior. On the basis of above arguments, it is hypothesized that there is a positive relationship between demographic factors and dimensions of deviant workplace Behaviour.

H1: there is a positive relationship between demographic factors and deviant workplace behavior.

Demographic factors include the factors like Gender, Marital Status, Age, Education, Experience, Tenure, Nature of Job and Level of job/Rank, etc.

Methodology

The Purpose of the present study is to investigate the impact of demographic factors contributing to deviant workplace behavior of employees in Pakistani public organizations. Moreover, demographic factors such as gender, age, and experience, are expected to link to deviant workplace behavior too.

This research design covers the type of explanatory research that helps to investigate the impact of changes in existing phenomena and particularly focus on the specific problem to explain the patterns of relationship among the different variables such as independent variables and dependent variable. Data collection process has been used cross-sectional via survey questionnaire. Furthermore, as this study focus on cross-sectional research will compare observation the different variable at the same time such as gender, marital status, education, experience, tenure and level of job or marginality position. The quantitative approach will be utilized in this research to collect and analysis of data because the results of quantitative research are relatively independent.

As the object of the present study is to investigate the impact of demographic factors contributing the deviant workplace behavior working in public organizations. Therefore the target population for this study consists of 20 universities, autonomous, special institutions and attached departments of the province of the Punjab, Pakistan. Sample from a population of employees will be determined on the base of guidelines presented by Krejcie & Morgan, (1970) from each public organization included in the population. The current study of will is conducted in 20 educational public organizations government of the Punjab, Pakistan based province capital, Lahore.

On the basis of information available at website of the Government of the Punjab (www.punjab.gov.pk) there are 40 Provincial departments, 108 Attached department, 152 Autonomous bodies and 12 Special institutions of the Govt. of the Punjab are working in the province of Punjab Pakistan from 152 and autonomous and special institution 100 related to education from the 20 organizations related to education and training sector are selected for study because education and training aligned organization can get the benefit of the outcome of the study. The reason behind chose these public organizations is that they all are provincial headquarter bases and there working cover whole province the Punjab territory. Sekaran, (2003) asserts that stratified sampling design is comparatively more efficient in the case of the heterogeneous population for meeting the objectives of the study, the Stratification of the population. Cluster sampling for the selection of organizations, the purposive, non-probability sampling technique the most suitable for the current study. In the selection of organization, only autonomous bodies who have their head office /headquarter at provincial capital Lahore but their working is speared in the different region throughout the Punjab will be chosen as a geographical area for conducting research. The self-administrated questionnaire will be used to collect information from the respondent, i.e., employees of public organizations.

Measures

In order to conduct the survey, a self-administrated questionnaire has been used as an instrument. The closed-ended type of questionnaire was used to conduct the study. The respondents were only asked to tick the answer given, from 1 to 5. The questionnaire was adopted from previous researcher work of eminent scholars.

Deviant workplace behavior in public sector organizations has been measured by 07 dimensions scale of deviance workplace behavior, divided into subscale that can be divided into 4 subscales to measure ‘Sabotage’ (Spector et al., 2006); 4 subscale to measure “Withdrawal” (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006); 04 subscale to measure “Theft” (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006); 3 subscale to measure to “Property deviance” 5 subscales to “ Misuse of time and resources” (Bashir et al., 2012); 5 subscale to measure to” Kickbacks /Corruption” (Bashir et al., 2012); 18-subscale to measure to “Abuse to others/Bullying” (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006). In survey questionnaire, DWB was measured at Five Likert scales that contains (1 to 5) such as strongly disagree, disagree, to strongly agree. The demographic factors, i.e., Gender, Marital Status, Age, education, experience, tuner, Level of job and rank of the job were measured at nominal scale.

Data Analysis

In order to data analysis, t-statistics and ANOVA statistics have been used to analyze that either there is any relationship exist between demographic factors and deviant workplace behavior or not.

Results and Discussion

Table No. 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Mean	S.D	Skewness
Deviance Workplace Behaviour	3.2147	.70103	-.432

Table 1 shows the values of mean, SD and skewness of the data. The value of mean workplace deviance is 3.21. The value of standard deviation is in the range of 0.701 while the value of skewness is in the limit of -1 to +1. The skewness result has confirmed that data is normal. As all objective variables have been proved normal, so the analysis can move forward to analysis further.

Table No. 2

Model Fitness Measures

	CMIN/DF	GFI	CFI	RMSEA	IFI
Model 1	2.208	0.962	0.995	.049	0.942

The above mentioned Table 2 showed Fit indices values for current research which are Chi-square=1624.46, DF=736, Normed Chi-square=2.208, GFI =0.962, AGFI =0.955, CFI =0.995, TLI =0.980, IFI =0.942, PCLOSE =0.078 and RMSEA = 0.049 all these results are within acceptance region so it means that measurement model is fit and it can be relied upon. For instance, the threshold value of RMSEA must be lesser than 0.08, and it is 0.04 in case of this research.

Table No.3

Gender and Deviance Workplace Behaviour

		t-test for Equality of Means							
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Difference	Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
DWB	Equal variances assumed	-.474	378	.636	-.03413	.07203		-.17577	.10751
	Equal variances not assumed	-.512	317.933	.609	-.03413	.06669		-.16533	.09708

The above-mentioned Table 3 exhibits the result of t-test to analyze the impact of gender on deviance workplace behavior. As significance value is not lesser than 0.05 and t-value is also not greater than t-tabulated, so these results can claim that gender has no significant variation for deviance which means that changing of gender will not bring change in deviance quantity. Male and female are at the same level of workplace deviance according to the results of this study as their responses indicated that regardless of the fact that there was a huge difference in their quantity in the same being tested.

Table No. 4

Marital Status and Deviance workplace Behaviour

		t-test for Equality of Means								
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Difference	Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
DWB	Equal variances assumed	-4.200	378	.000	-.28169	.06708		-.41358	-.14980	
	Equal variances not assumed	-4.190	358.58	.000	-.28169	.06722		-.41389	-.14949	

The above-mentioned Table 4 is showing the result of t-test to analyze the impact of marital on deviance. As significance value is lesser than 0.05 and t-value is also greater than t-tabulated, so these results can claim that marital status has a significant variation for deviance which means that changing of marital status will bring change in deviance quantity. According to the results of this study single and married persons are at the different levels of workplace deviance as their responses indicated. Literature has proved the same thing that

deviance can be varied for single and married employees as married employees are more careful regarding this sort of behavior while single employees are more engaged in this sort of deviant practices.

Table No. 5

Education and Deviant Workplace Behaviour ANOVA

ANOVA

DWB

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.778	5	4.156	10.612	.000
Within Groups	146.453	374	.392		
Total	167.231	379			

The above-mentioned Table 5 is showing the results of ANOVA to analyze the impact of education on DWB. As significance value is lesser than 0.05 and F-value is also greater than F-tabulated so these results can claim that education has a significant variation for deviance which means that changing of education will bring change in deviance quantity. Educated and lesser educated persons are at the different levels of workplace deviance according to the results of this study as their responses indicated. Literature has proved the same thing that deviance can be varied for lesser and higher educated employees as educated employees are tried not to engage in these sorts of deviant practices.

Table No. 6

Education and DWB Post Hoc

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Deviance Workplace Behaviour (DWB)

(I) Education	(J) Education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than Graduation	University Graduation	.24841	.13440	.980	-.1486	.6455
	Master degree	-.06388	.13226	1.000	-.4546	.3268
	MPhil	.53569*	.13844	.002	.1267	.9447
	PhD	.22414	.19743	1.000	-.3591	.8074
	Other	-.10133	.21711	1.000	-.7427	.5400
University Graduation	less than graduation	-.24841	.13440	.980	-.6455	.1486
	Master degree	-.31229*	.08093	.002	-.5514	-.0732
	MPhil	.28727*	.09067	.025	.0194	.5551
	PhD	-.02427	.16743	1.000	-.5189	.4704
	Other	-.34974	.19024	1.000	-.9118	.2123
Master degree	less than graduation	.06388	.13226	1.000	-.3268	.4546

	university graduation	.31229*	.08093	.002	.0732	.5514
	MPhil	.59957*	.08747	.000	.3412	.8580
	PhD	.28802	.16572	1.000	-.2015	.7776
	Other	-.03745	.18874	1.000	-.5950	.5201
MPhil	less than graduation	-.53569*	.13844	.002	-.9447	-.1267
	university graduation	-.28727*	.09067	.025	-.5551	-.0194
	master degree	-.59957*	.08747	.000	-.8580	-.3412
	PhD	-.31155	.17069	1.000	-.8158	.1927
	Other	-.63702*	.19312	.016	-1.2075	-.0665
PhD	less than graduation	-.22414	.19743	1.000	-.8074	.3591
	university graduation	.02427	.16743	1.000	-.4704	.5189
	master degree	-.28802	.16572	1.000	-.7776	.2015
	MPhil	.31155	.17069	1.000	-.1927	.8158
	Other	-.32547	.23897	1.000	-1.0314	.3805
Other	less than graduation	.10133	.21711	1.000	-.5400	.7427
	university graduation	.34974	.19024	1.000	-.2123	.9118
	master degree	.03745	.18874	1.000	-.5201	.5950
	MPhil	.63702*	.19312	.016	.0665	1.2075
	PhD	.32547	.23897	1.000	-.3805	1.0314

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: the researcher

Table 6 exhibits Post hoc test which has been explained in the above-mentioned Table is classifying the categories which have larger deviance in comparison to the other categories. This can be judged by seeing the significance values mentioned very next to different classes or options of variables. In Table 6, it has been shown that employees are having M. Phil qualification are marked significant in front of employees who have qualification lesser than the graduation. And the same sort of pattern can be observed in all other observations as lesser education that M. Phil is resulting into deviant Behaviours according to the post hoc results.

Table No. 7

Employment Nature and DWB ANOVA

ANOVA

DWB

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.662	2	1.831	4.220	.015
Within Groups	163.569	377	.434		
Total	167.231	379			

The above-mentioned Table 7 is showing the results of ANOVA to analyze the impact of employment nature on deviance. As significance value is lesser than 0.05 and F-value is also greater than F-tabulated so these results can claim that employment nature has a significant variation for deviance which means that changing of employment nature will bring change in deviance quantity. Permanent and temporary employees are at the different levels of workplace deviance according to the results of this study as their responses indicated. Literature has proved the same thing that deviance can be varied for temporary employees as educated employees are tried not to engage in these sorts of deviant practices.

Table No. 8

Employment Nature and DWB Post Hoc

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Deviance

Bonferroni

(I) Employment	(J) Employment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Permanent	Contract	-.21416*	.07407	.012	-.3923	-.0361
	work charge basis	-.10966	.13178	1.000	-.4266	.2072
Contract	permanent	.21416*	.07407	.012	.0361	.3923
	work charge basis	.10449	.13824	1.000	-.2279	.4369
Work charge basis	permanent	.10966	.13178	1.000	-.2072	.4266
	Contract	-.10449	.13824	1.000	-.4369	.2279

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 8 Post hoc test which has been explained in the above-mentioned table is classifying the categories which have larger deviance in comparison to the other categories. This can be judged by seeing the significance values mentioned very next to different classes or options of variables. The post hoc results in the above-given table are showing that permanent and contract employees have a difference in their deviance because both of them are significant for each other but work charge basis employees are not involved in much of deviance. Between permanent and contract employees, the former ones are more deviant as they have complete assurance of their jobs while working in public sector. However, a change of sector can also change such trend because private sector often does not give that kind of autonomy to its employees.

Table No. 9

Level of Job/ Rank and Deviance ANOVA

ANOVA

DWB

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.307	2	6.153	14.974	.000
Within Groups	154.924	377	.411		
Total	167.231	379			

The above-mentioned Table 9 is showing the results of ANOVA to analyze the impact of different job level on deviance workplace behavior. As significance value is lesser than 0.05 and F-value is also greater than F-tabulated, so these results can claim that level of job/rank has a significant variation for deviance which means that changing of job level will bring change in deviance quantity. Employees on managerial and employees on on-managerial posts are at the different levels of workplace deviance according to the results of this study as their responses indicated. Literature has proved the same thing that deviance can the majority be coming from the higher rank employees as they sometimes do it in a rage of their power.

Post hoc test which has been explained in the above-mentioned table is classifying the categories which have larger deviance in comparison to the other categories. This can be judged by seeing the significance values mentioned very next to different classes or options of variables. The table has been showing that for lower level employees, other two categories are also not significant which means that they are non-deviant. But deviant behaviors start from middle-level employees and keep on increasing till top-level employees as they have affirmed a place in an organization, so they often find room to do different sort of incivilities and many other deviant actions.

Table No. 10

Job Level/ Rank and DWB Post Hoc

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Deviance

Bonferroni							
(I) Joblevel	(J) Joblevel	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Top level	middle level	-.45618*	.08544	.000	-.6616	-.2507	
	lower level	-.23978	.11801	.129	-.5236	.0440	
Middle level	top level	.45618*	.08544	.000	.2507	.6616	
	lower level	.21640	.09905	.089	-.0218	.4546	
Lower level	top level	.23978	.11801	.129	-.0440	.5236	
	middle level	-.21640	.09905	.089	-.4546	.0218	

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10 has been showing that for lower level employees, other two categories are also not significant which means that they are non-deviant. But deviant behaviors start from middle-level employees and keep on increasing till top-level employees as they have affirmed a place in an organization, so they often find room to do different sort of incivilities and many other deviant actions.

Future Directions

Although, the present study has provided support for the hypothesized relationship among the exogenous and endogenous, the results have to be interpreted under consideration of the some study' limitations:

The first, this study assumes and adopts a cross-sectional research design which does not allow casual inferences to be made from the population. Therefore, a longitudinal research design in future needs to be

considered to measure the theoretical constructs at different points in time to confirm the findings of the present study.

Secondly, the present adopts a non-probability sampling technique, i.e., quota sampling in which all elements of the target population were not captured, as such the extent to which sample size represents the entire population cannot be known. The use of quota sampling has limited the extent to which the findings of the study can be generalized to the population.

Thirdly, in the present study, it is possible that the respondents belong to public sector organizations might have underreported their deviant behavior on closed-ended survey questionnaire. Therefore, in future, the researcher may wish to employ other strategies, i.e., direct observations, interview, case study, etc. to assess deviance workplace behavior of public sector organizations.

Fourthly, in the present study, it is pertinent to mention that the deviant workplace behavior reported was subjective. The outcome of the present research demonstrates that subjective data is valid and reliable for assessing deviant workplace behavior. Therefore, in future, the outcome of the present research may be replicated by using objective measures of deviant workplace behavior.

Fifthly, the outcome of present study offers quite limited generalizability because it focused mainly on employees who are working in public organizations located in Lahore the provincial headquarter of Punjab, Pakistan. Therefore, in future it is essential; in order to generalize the findings include employees who are working in the other Province of Pakistan.

Conclusion

The current study has provided additional indication and evidence to the growing body of knowledge regarding the impact of demographic factors, and deviant workplace behavior, despite some limitations of the present study, the results of the study lend support to the theoretical propositions, key objectives and answer research questions. In spite of, there have been number of studies carried out by examining the underlying antecedents and causes of deviant workplace behavior. However, this study addressed the theoretical gap by incorporating Demographic factors contributing deviant workplace behavior.

The present study also lends support to theoretical and empirical framework independent variable Demographic factors and between the dependent variables Deviant workplace behavior. This theoretical framework of this study has also added to the domain of new knowledge. The outcome of this empirical study also provides important practical implication to the head of the institutions, managers, and organization too. In spite of some limitations of the present study, several recommendations, directions and guidelines for future research has been drawn in this study.

REFERENCES

- i. *Abbasi, A (2011), "Public Sector Governance in Pakistan: Board of Investment (BOI)."International Journal of Politics and Good Governance 2(2).*
- ii. *Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., &Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 89(1), 947–965.*
- iii. *Anjum, M. A., &Parvez, A. (2013). Counterproductive Behaviour at Work: A Comparison of Blue Collar and White Collar Workers. Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 7(3), 417–434*
- iv. *Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J., & Lay, M. (2005).The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behaviour. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 5(4), 43–55.*
- v. *Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 7(5), 586–598.*
- vi. *Appelbaum, S.H.&Shaprio, B.T(2006), Diagnosis and remedies for Deviant workplace behaviour, Journal of American Academy of Business, Vol 9(2)pp.14-20*
- vii. *Bashir, S., Nasir, M., Qayyum, S., & Bashir, A. (2012). Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behaviors in Public Sector Organizations of Pakistan. Public Organization Review, 12(4), 357–366.*

- viii. Bashir, S., Nasir, Z. M., Saeed, S., & Ahmed, M. (2011). Breach of psychological contract, perception of politics and organizational cynicism: Evidence from Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 884-888
- ix. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- x. Bass, B.M., 1998. *Transformational leadership: Industry, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- xi. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. 1995. *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for research*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- xii. Bass, B.M., B.J. Avolio, D.I. Jung and Y. Berson, 2003. Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 207-218
- xiii. Bolton, L., & Grawitch, M. J. (2011). When good employees go bad: How organizations may be facilitating workplace deviance. *Good Company*, 5(2), 1-2.
- xiv. Bordia, Prashant; Restubog, Simon Lloyd D.; Tang, Robert L.(2008) *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 93(5), Sep, 1104-1117
- xv. Brkic, H., & Aleksic, A. (2016). *INTERPERSONAL DEVIANT WORK BEHAVIOUR-EXPLORATORY STUDY AMONG EMPLOYEES IN CROATIA*. Paper presented at the An Enterprise Odyssey. *International Conference Proceedings*.
- xvi. Brown, P. (2008). *The body and society: Men, women, and sexual renunciation in early Christianity: Columbia University Press*.
- xvii. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- xviii. Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(3), 177-184.
- xix. Claire P. Monks, Peter K. Smith, Paul Naylor, Christine Barter, Jane L. Ireland, Iain Coyne *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Volume 14, Issue 2, March-April 2009, Pages 146-156
- xx. Carragher, S. M., & Buckley, M. R. (2008). Attitudes towards benefits and Behavioural intentions and their relationship to Absenteeism, Performance, and Turnover among nurses. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal*, 4(2), 89
- xxi. Coffin, B. (2003). Breaking the silence on white collar crime. *Risk Management*, 50(9), 8-9.
- xxii. Derina, N. & Gökçeb, S. G. (2016) Are cyberloafers also innovators?: A study on the relationship between cyberloafing and innovative work Behaviour *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences* 235 (2016) 694 – 700
- xxiii. Fatima, A., Atif, Q.M, Saqib, A., and Haider, A. (2012) A Path Model Examining the Relations among Organizational Injustice, Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Job Satisfaction *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 3, No. 696-701
- xxiv. Faulk, D., & Hicks, M. J. (2015). The impact of bus transit on employee turnover: Evidence from quasi-experimental samples. *Urban Studies*, 1-17. Field, T. (2016, 0321). Retrieved from Bully On Line: <http://bullyonline.org/old/workbully/quotes.html>
- xxv. Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291-309
- xxvi. Gabbidon, S. L., Patrick, P. A., & Peterson, S. A. (2006). An empirical assessment of employee theft lawsuits involving allegations of employer misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(2), 175-183.
- xxvii. *Gakovic, A., & Tetrick, L. E. (2003b). Psychological contract breach as a source of strain for employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18, 235-246.
- xxviii. Galperin, B. L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: An empirical examination in Canada and Mexico*. Concordia University. Retrieved from <http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/2433/>
- xxx. Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial Behaviour in organizations*. Sage Publication.
- xxxi. Georgakopoulos, A., Wilkin, L., & Kent, B. (2011). Workplace bullying: A complex problem in contemporary organizations. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(3), 1-2
- xxxii. Griffin, R.W. Lopez. Y.P (2005) "Bad Behavior" in Organizations: A Review and Typology for Future Research, *Journal of Management* Vol 31, Issue 6, 2005 First Published December 1, 2005.
- xxxiii. Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work Behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30-42.
- xxxiv. Gruys, M. L. (1999). *The dimensionality of deviant employee performance in the workplace*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- xxxv. Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work Behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30-42.
- xxxvi. Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2002). Exploring service sabotage the antecedents, types and consequences of frontline, deviant, antiservice behaviors. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(3), 163-183.
- xxxvii. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M. & Sarstedt, M. (2013) *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- xxxviii. Hollinger, R. C. (1986). Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance. *Deviant Behaviour*, 7(1), 53-75.
- xxxix. Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and Informal Social Controls of Employee Deviance*. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 333-343.

- xl. Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees* (Vol. 126). Lexington Books/Lexington, MA. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/abstractdb/AbstractDBDetails.aspx?id=89084>.
- xli. Hystad, S. W., Mearns, K. J., & Eid, J. (2014). *Moral disengagement as a mechanism between perceptions of organisational injustice and deviant work behaviours*. *Safety Science*, 68, 138-145.
- xlii. Islam, N (2004). *Sifarish, Sychophats, power and collectivism: administrative culture in Pakistan*. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 70(2).
- xliii. Izawa, S., Kodama, M., & Nomura, S. (2006). *Dimensions of hostility in Japanese undergraduate students*. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 13(2), 147-152.
- xliv. Javed, R., Amjad, M., Faqeer-Ul-Ummi, U. Y., & Bukhari, R. (2014) *Investigating Factors Affecting Employee Workplace Deviant Behavior*. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 9(3), 1073.
- xlv. Johnson, J. A., & Ostendorf, F. (1993). *Clarification of the five factor model with the Abridged Big Five dimensional circumplex*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 563-576.
- xlvi. John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). *The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives*. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press
- xlvii. Kantan, P. & Erülker, F. (2013) *The Effect of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviours: An Empirical Study on the Employees of Manufacturing Enterprises*. *The Macrotheme Review* 2(4), 144-161
- xlviii. Kohut, M. R. (2007). *The complete guide to understanding, controlling, and stopping bullies and bullying at work*. Ocala, FL: Atlantic Publishing. Lim, V. K. (2002). *The IT way of loafing on the job: cyberloafing, neutralizing and organizational justice*. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23(5), 675-694.
- xlix. Koslowsky, M. (2000). *A new perspective on employee lateness*. *Applied Psychology*, 49(3), 390-407. Lambert, L. S., Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2003). *Breach and fulfillment of the psychological contract: A comparison of traditional and expanded views*. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 895-934.
- l. Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970) *Determining Sample Size for Research, Educational and Psychology Measurement* 1970 30,607-610.
- li. Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). *Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work Behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction*. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.
- lii. Mangione, T. W., & Quinn, R. P. (1975). *Job satisfaction, counterproductive behavior, and drug use at work*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(1), 114.
- liii. Nadeem, M., Ahmad, R., Ahmad, N., Batool, S. R., & Shafique, N. (2015) *Favoritism, nepotism and cronyism as predictors of job satisfaction: Evidences from Pakistan*. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, 8, 224-228.
- liv. Nasir, M., & Bashir, A. (2012) *Examining workplace deviance in public sector organizations of Pakistan*. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 39(4), 240-253.
- lv. Nevins-Bennett, C. (2016) *Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Academic' and Administrative Staff' and Its effective on the Organizational Effectiveness*. *Advances in Social Sciences Research) Journal*, 3(2)29B41. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.32.1561>. 30.
- lvi. Niehoff, B. P., & Paul, R. J. (2000). *Causes of employee theft and strategies that HR managers can use for prevention*. *Human Resource Management*, 39(1), 51-64.
- lvii. O'Boyle, E.H., Jr., Forsyth, D.R., Banks, G.C., & McDaniel, M.A. (2012). *A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work Behaviour: A social exchange perspective*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557-579
- lviii. O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., & O'Boyle, A. S. (2011). *Bad apples or bad barrels: An examination of group-and organizational-level effects in the study of counterproductive work Behaviour*. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(1), 39-69.
- lix. Oghojafor, B. E., Muo, F. I., & Olufayo, T. O. (2012). *Perspective of bullying problems at workplace in Nigeria: The experience of workers*. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 1(3), 1-18.
- lx. Pradhan, S., & Pradhan, K.R. (2014) *Transformational Leadership and Deviant Workplace Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Organizational Justice* *proceedings of the First Asia Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Social Sciences (AP14SINGAPORE Conference) Singapore, 1-3 August 2014 Paper ID_ S437 1 ISBN-978-1-941505-15-1- www.globalbizresearch.org*.
- lxi. Paulhus, D. L., & Jones, D. N. (2011, January). *Introducing a short measure of the Dark Triad*. Poster presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio.
- lxii. Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2009). *Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks*. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 109(1), 29-44.
- lxiii. Puffer, S. M. (1987). *Prosocial Behaviour, noncompliant Behaviour, and work performance among commission salespeople*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 615
- lxiv. Quratulain, S., & Khan, A. K. (2015). *Red Tape, Resigned Satisfaction, Public Service Motivation, and Negative Employee Attitudes and Behaviours Testing a Model of Moderated Mediation*. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 35(4), 307-332.

- lxv. Robinson, S. L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). *Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. Journal of Organizational Behavior* (1986-1998), 1.
- lxvi. Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (1995). *Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue Behaviour. Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16(3), 289–298.
- lxvii. Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). *A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572.
- lxviii. Robinson, S. L., & O’Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). *Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial Behaviour of employees. Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 658–672.
- lxix. Rousseau, D. M. (1989), “*Psychological and implied contracts in organizations,*” *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 2 No.2, pp. 121-139.
- lxx. Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2010) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach, 5th edition, Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.*
- lxxi. Sekaran, U. (n.d.). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach. 2003. John Willey and Sons, New York.*
- lxxii. Shakir, K., & Siddiqui, S. J. (2014). *The Impact of Work-Life Balance Policies on Deviant Workplace Behaviour in Pakistan. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(6).
- lxxiii. Smith, S. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). *Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 18(2), 204–218.
- lxxiv. Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). *The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Retrieved from <http://doi.apa.org/psycinfo/2004-19514-007>*
- lxxv. Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). *The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive Behaviours created equal? Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3), 446–460.
- lxxvi. Shakir, K., & Siddiqui, S. J. (2014). *The Impact of Work-Life Balance Policies on Deviant Workplace Behavior in Pakistan. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(6).
- lxxvii. Taylor, A. (2007, January 4). *Gambling at work ‘costs employers £300M a year. Financial Times. Retrieved from <http://www.ft.com/home/us>.*
- lxxviii. Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (1999). *The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. Human Relations*, 52(7), 895–922.
- lxxix. Usmani, S., Kalpina, K., & Husain, (2013) *J. Sleep Deprivation and workplace deviance: a mediation approach.*
- lxxx. Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). *Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. Organization Science*, 7(2), 151–165.
- lxxxi. Yildiz, B., Alpkan, L., Ates, H., & Sezen, B. (2015) *Determinants of constructive deviance: the mediator role of psychological ownership. International Business Research*, 8(4), 107
- lxxxii. Yukl, G. A. (1994; 2005). *Leadership in organizations (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice- Hall.*